

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15, and 17-32 have been canceled. Claims 5, 12, 16, and 33 are in this application.

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,850,457 (Gefvert) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,118,876 (Ruzicka), U.S. Patent No. 5,589,718 (Lee), U.S. Patent No. 5,470,253 (Siems et al.), U.S. Patent No. 3,824,524 (Glover) and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) of Figs. 12-14.

Independent claim 5 recites in part the following:

"in which the front left audio signal output terminal is arranged to the right of both of the front right audio signal output terminal and the rear right audio signal output terminal on the back panel as viewed when facing the rear portion of the electronic apparatus, and the rear left audio signal output terminal is arranged to the right of both of the front right audio signal output terminal and the rear right audio signal output terminal on the back panel as viewed when facing the rear portion of the electronic apparatus," (Emphasis added.)

An example of the above arrangement of the audio signal output terminals is provided in the present application. With regard thereto, reference is made to Fig. 2 of the present application. Further, advantages of such specific arrangement of terminals are indicated throughout the present application.

In explaining the above 103 rejection with regard to claim 5, and as best understood, the Examiner appears to assert that Gefvert (and in particular Fig. 8B thereof) discloses the "output terminals corresponding to the left channels being arranged to the right of the output terminals corresponding to the right channels when viewed from the front of the receiver."

(See lines 8-11 of page 3 of the present Office Action.) The Examiner then appears to assert that if Gelvert is modified "as taught by AAPA," such arrangement results in "all of the audio signal output terminals corresponding to the left channels being arranged to the right of all of the audio signal output terminals corresponding to the right channels as viewed from the rear of the apparatus . . . ." (See line 18 of page 3 to line 3 of page 4 of the present Office Action. Also see line 19 of page 12 to line 9 of page 13 of the present Office Action.) Additionally, the Examiner stated that the test for obviousness "is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." (See lines 13-14 of page 13 of the present Office Action.)

In response, it is respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

First, and as stated by the Examiner, Fig. 8B of Gefvert "discloses the output terminals corresponding to the left channels being arranged to the right of the output terminals corresponding to the right channels when viewed from the front of the receiver." (See lines 8-11 of page 3 of the present Office Action.) As indicated above, claim 5 of the present application recites "the front left audio signal output terminal is arranged to the right of both of the front right audio signal output terminal and the rear right audio signal output terminal on the back panel as viewed when facing the rear portion . . . and the rear left audio signal output terminal is arranged to the right of both of the front right audio signal output terminal and the rear right audio signal output terminal on the back panel as viewed when facing the rear portion . . . ." Thus, the positional arrangement of the left and right terminals shown in Fig. 8B of Gefvert is not the same as that of claim 5 and, in fact, is the opposite to that of claim 5.

Figs. 12-14 of the present application (hereinafter, merely "Figs. 12-14") do not disclose "the front left audio signal output terminal is arranged to the right of both of the front right audio signal output terminal and the rear right audio signal output terminal on the back panel as viewed when facing the rear portion of the electronic apparatus," as specifically recited in claim 5. That is, and as clearly illustrated in Figs. 12-14, the front left audio signal output terminal of Figs. 12-14 is not arranged to the right of the rear right audio signal output terminal. Instead, such front left audio signal output terminal of Figs. 12-14 is arranged to the left of the rear right audio signal output terminal. Such arrangement of Figs. 12-14 may cause the speaker cables to cross which may make the installation thereof more difficult as described in the present application.

Therefore, neither Fig. 8B of Gefvert nor Figs. 12-14 of the present application disclose the arrangement of the left and right audio signal output terminals specifically recited in claim 5 of the present application. As a result, even if back panel 100 of Fig. 8B of Gefvert were replaced by the arrangement shown in Figs. 12-14, the resultant system would not be the same as that recited in claim 5 of the present application.

Second, and as indicated above, the Examiner stated that the test for obviousness "is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." (See lines 13-14 of page 13 of the present Office Action.) In response, it is respectfully submitted that Fig. 8B of Gefvert and Figs. 12-14 of the present application when viewed together would not have suggested to one skilled in the art the exact terminal arrangement recited in claim 5. Instead, it is submitted that after viewing Fig. 8B of Gefvert and Figs. 12-14 of the present application, one skilled in the art would have selected either the terminal arrangement of Fig. 8B of

Gefvert or that of Figs. 12-14 of the present application as the terminal arrangement to be used. In other words, by merely viewing Fig. 8B of Gefvert and Figs. 12-14 of the present application-----without the benefit of knowing the arrangement of claim 5 (i.e., without the benefit of impermissible hindsight), such skilled person would probably not have devised the arrangement of claim 5.

Third, it is respectfully submitted that Fig. 8B of Gefvert effectively teaches away from the terminal arrangement of claim 5. That is, and as previously indicated and as stated by the Examiner, Fig. 8B of Gefvert "discloses the output terminals corresponding to the left channels being arranged to the right of the output terminals corresponding to the right channels when viewed from the front of the receiver." (See lines 8-11 of page 3 of the present Office Action.) On the other hand and as previously indicated, the terminal arrangement of claim 5 is viewed facing the rear portion and, as a result, has a terminal arrangement which is opposite to that of Fig. 8B of Gefvert. It is respectfully submitted that by providing a terminal arrangement which is the opposite to that of claim 5, Fig. 8B of Gefvert effectively teaches away from using the terminal arrangement of claim 5.

Fourth, and as previously indicated, the terminal arrangement set forth in claim 5 may have advantages which are indicated throughout the present application. Such advantages may include (i) facilitating the connection between the apparatus and the speakers by routing wires directly from the apparatus to the speakers without having to cross-over other wires which could cause confusion to the installer, and (ii) reducing the possibility of a short-circuit which may occur when exposed wires cross over each other as, for example, in the case illustrated in Fig. 14 of the present application. As is to be

appreciated, neither the terminal arrangement of Fig. 8B of Gefvert nor that of Figs. 12-14 have such advantages.

Thus, for at least the above-described reasons, it is respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn. For similar or somewhat similar reasons, it is also respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee ('718), Siems, Glover, and AAPA, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,984,717 (Lee).

Claim 12 is dependent from independent claim 5. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on Lee '717 to overcome the above-described deficiencies of the applied combination of Gefvert and AAPA. Accordingly, it is also respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gefvert in view of AAPA.

For similar or somewhat similar reasons to those described above with regard to claim 5, it is also respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection of claim 33 be withdrawn.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 09/800,056

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-755

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant(s)

LD-447\1034699\_1.DOC